

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim 23 has been amended. Therefore, Claims 23, 26, 27, 32, 33, and 35-49 remain pending in this application. The applicants respectfully submit that this amendment places the claims in condition for allowance. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request entry of this amendment and request reconsideration of the remaining claims.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112:

Claims 23, 26-27, 32, and 46-47 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112. The phrase objected to by the Examiner has been deleted from claim 23.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103:

Claims 23, 26-27, 32, 42-43, and 46-47 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious under Collins, et al. EP 0 837 489 A2 (hereinafter *Collins EP*) in view of Collins USPN 6,361,644 (hereinafter *Collins '644*).

The Examiner cited element 75 in Fig. 5, as being a heater element. Instead, line 30, of Collins et al. states that element 75 are spacer rings. Page 9, lines 25-30, of Collins et al. states that element 72 forms the heaters. Page 10, lines 43-44, of Collins et al. does say that 72, 74, and 75 are temperature control apparatus, but this cannot be used to state that element 75 is a heater. Instead, these are elements that provide temperature control, which are formed by a cooler 74, a heater 72, and a spacer 75. The Examiner failed to point out anything that teaches that the spacer 75 is heated. The Examiner cited reference number 1090 in Fig. 20 of Collins et al. as indicating the conformal thermal interface recited in claim 26. Claim 26 recites heating a thermal control block which is in physical contact with the conformal thermal interface, which is in physical contact with the plasma processing chamber. Nothing in Collins et al. discloses or makes obvious that the item 1090 in Fig. 20 of Collins et al. is in physical contact with the plasma processing chamber and a thermal control block, which is heated. The Examiner failed to also point out anything in Collins that teaches or suggests these deficiencies. For at least these reasons, claim 23, as amended, is not anticipated or made obvious by Collins et al. in view of Collins.

Claims 33, 35-41, and 48-49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious under Collins, et al. EP 0 837 489 A2 (hereinafter *Collins EP*) in view of Collins USPN 6,572,732 (hereinafter *Collins '732*).

As discussed above, the Examiner cited element 75 in Fig. 5, as being a heater element. Instead, 15, line 30, of Collins et al. states that element 75 are spacer rings. Page 9, lines 25-30, of Collins et al. states that element 72 forms the heaters. Page 10, lines 43-44, of Collins et al. does say that 72, 74, and 75 are temperature control apparatus, but this cannot be used to state that element 75 is a heater. Instead, these are elements that provide temperature control, which are formed by a cooler 74, a heater 72, and a spacer 75. The Examiner failed to point out anything that teaches that the spacer 75 is heated. The Examiner cited reference number 1090 in Fig. 20 of Collins et al. as indicating the conformal thermal interface recited in claim 26. Claims 33 and 37 recite heating a thermal control block, which is in physical contact with the conformal thermal interface, which is in physical contact with the plasma processing chamber. Nothing in Collins et al. discloses or makes obvious that the item 1090 in Fig. 20 of Collins et al. is in physical contact with the plasma processing chamber and a thermal control block, which is heated. In addition, claim 37 further recites that the heating block is a resistive heating block. The Examiner failed to point out anything in Collins et al that teaches resistive heating of spacer 75. The Examiner failed to also point out anything in Collins that teaches or suggests these deficiencies. For at least these reasons, claims 33 and 37 are not anticipated or made obvious by Collins et al. in view of Collins.

Dependent claims 26, 27, 32, 35, 36, and 38-49 are also patentably distinct from the cited references for at least the same reasons as those recited above for the independent claims, upon which they ultimately depend. These dependent claims recite additional limitations that further distinguish these dependent claims from the cited references. For example, claims 27, 35, and 42 further recite biasing the thermal blocks against the first section of the roof. The Examiner fails to point out anything in the references that teach or suggest this.

In addition, claim 43, further recites that the biasing is spring biasing. The Examiner stated on page 5 of the office action, that the apparatus limitations of claim 43 have little weight, unless they affect the process in a manipulative sense. The recitation of spring biasing in claim 43, recites how the step of biasing is accomplished.

In addition, claim 27, as amended, recites biasing the thermal blocks against a first section of the roof portion and that the coil is placed adjacent to a second section of the roof portion different than that first roof portion. The Examiner did not point out this feature in the cited references. For at least these reasons, claims 26, 27, 32, 35, 36, and 38-49 are not unpatentable over the cited references.

Applicants believe that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP



Michael Lee
Registration No. 31,846

P. O. Box 778
Berkeley, CA 94704-0778
Tel. (650) 961-8300